

REMARKS

1. Claims 21, 32 and 41 have been amended to render the language definite as the Examiner recommended.

2-3. Claim 32 has been amended to recite an “entirely – transparent planar sheet” and which has uniform thickness –throughout—and thus clearly not anticipated by Gaible et al ‘182 which includes projecting hook-like fasteners and an opaque web.

Claim 41 has been amended to recite “- entirely- -transparent planar sheets” and thus clearly not anticipated by Gaible et al ‘182 which has an opaque portion 230, col. 4, lines 66 and following to col. 5.

Claims 35-37 depend on Claim 32 (currently amended) and Claim 42 depends on Claim 41 (currently amended) and accordingly, Claims 32 (currently amended), 35-37, and Claims 41 (currently amended)-42 are not anticipated by Gaible et al ‘182.

4. Claim 32 as now currently amended recites “uniform thickness throughout” and thus clearly not anticipated by Kodl ‘693, which requires a resealable closure device 14 and a connector 20. Claims 35-36 depend on Claim 32 (currently amended) and are not anticipated by the cited art.

5-6. Claims 32 and 35-37 are not obvious in light of Yanagisawa ‘527 and Adair ‘188. Claim 32 provides “a flat entirely planar sheet of uniform thickness throughout” and is clearly not obvious in light of Yanagisawa ‘527, which employs a rubber band in the embodiments of FIGS. 9 and 10. Moreover, the cover 34 works in conjunction with a “partition member” 32 to which the rubber band is attached to secure the cover 34 or 34’. Accordingly, it is not clear if the cover of Yanagisawa ‘527 will stay on the keyboard or a portion thereof or the rubber bands would not be necessary.

With respect to Adair ‘188, the disclosure recites a body 13 which may conform to the particular shape of the monitor module used. Adair ‘188 is simply a bag that employs an adhesive tape as a closure.

Applicant believes that Yanagisawa ‘527 and Adair ‘188 are not properly combined. Yanagisawa ‘527 teaches a flat sheet that requires rubber bands be used to secure it to a portion or all of a keyboard whereas Adair ‘188 teaches a bag that is sealed with tape. Moreover, Adair ‘188 does not teach an “upper” and “lower” member as applicant uses

these terms. In addition, Adair '188 does not provide an elongated opening as does the present invention. Adair's opening is rolled up and taped shut.

Accordingly, Claims 32(currently amended), 35-37 are not obvious in light of the cited art.

7. Claims 33-34 are not obvious over Yanagisawa in view of Adair, as above, and further in view of Okamura '690 or Young (GB '922A). The Okamura '690 and Young '922A references both employ molded keyboard covers and accordingly are not properly combinable with Yanagisawa '527. Moreover, the bag of Adair '188 does not teach or suggest the use of adhesive tape to attach the bag to an enclosed keyboard.

In addition, the use of rubber bands to attach a cover is not the same as adhesive strips.

Finally, it is important to note that Claims 33-34 depend on Claim 32 (currently amended) which is not taught or suggested by the cited art in any appropriate combination.

8. Claims 21 and 24-26 are not obvious over Yanagisawa '527 and Adair '188 in further view of the IBM reference 1994. As currently amended, Claim 21 recites "at least one flat and entirely transparent planar sheet of pliable plastic film of uniform thickness throughout" thus clearly distinguishing over the cited art in any appropriate combination.

Applicant repeats that the combination of Adair '188, a bag, and Yanagisawa '527, a plastic sheet held in place by rubber bands, are not appropriately combined. Further, the IBM reference bears no resemblance whatsoever to the sheet recited in Claim 21 (currently amended).

9. Claims 22-23 are not obvious over the cited art for the reasons cited hereinabove in paragraph 8 with regard to Claims 21, 24-26. The above reasons are equally applicable to the package of covers as recited in Claims 21 (currently amended), 22-23.

Accordingly, Claims 22-23 are not obvious in light of the cited art in any appropriate combination.

10. Claims 21, 24-26, and 28-30 are not obvious in light of Gaible et al '182 and the IBM reference for the reasons discussed hereinabove in paragraphs 2-3. Claim 21 (currently amended) recites an "entirely" transparent sheet of uniform thickness "throughout" which is

not taught or suggested by the cited art in any appropriate combination whether individually or in a package.

Accordingly, Claims 21 (currently amended), 24-26, and 28-30 are not obvious in light of the cited art in any appropriate combination.

11. The allowable subject matter of Claims 27, 31 and 38 is acknowledged.

A telephone interview is respectfully requested to resolve any remaining issue prior to any further or final action on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,


Arthur G. Yeager, Reg. No. 19,892

245 East Adams Street, Suite 1
Jacksonville, FL 32202-3336
Tel: (904) 355-9631
Fax: (904) 355-9632

Date: Oct. 13, 2003